

REMARKS

Applicant considers the title descriptive of the claimed method. If the Examiner desires a different title, his suggestion would be appreciated.

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the German translation and emphasize the one-point perspective image data for the neighboring location.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-6 as unpatentable over Peleg et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Peleg et al. teaches a method of generating panoramic mosaics from multiple individual one-point perspective video frames. Multiple strips from individual video frames are projected onto a cylindrical surface such that the optical flow becomes parallel and pasted into a panoramic mosaic.

In contrast to Peleg et al., applicant's invention is a method for the inspection of real existing pipes, wherein a camera with a fish eye lens captures single hemi or full spherical (panoramic) digital image at a specific location. Given a known geometry of the real existing pipe, an intermediate image is then calculated by virtually setting a camera at a fictive location, i.e., a location at which no original image is provided. This is accomplished by virtually projecting the originally captured spherical image onto the known geometry of the pipe interior in which the image is captured, calculating a virtual intermediate image from the

projection as a one-point perspective image and displaying the result.

Peleg et al. captures multiple non-distorted one-point perspective video images and transforms them into distorted projections on a cylinder. Applicant provides a distorted single spherical still image which is projected to the known geometry of a pipe and transformed into a non-distorted one-point perspective image which is finally displayed. It must be emphasized that Peleg et al. creates a panoramic image from multiple one-point perspective images whereas applicant creates a one-point image from a panoramic image.

Since Peleg et al. does not teach the steps of applicant's method of inspecting channel pipes, it cannot be a bar to applicant's Claims 4-6 which set forth applicant's method steps. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 4-6 should be withdrawn.

In view of the amendment to Claim 4 and the above remarks, it is believed that Claims 4-6 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Herbert William Larson /

Herbert W. Larson
Registration No. 21008
Attorney for Assignee
LARSON & LARSON, PA
11199 69TH Street North
Largo, FL 33773

Customer No. 22497